

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-6, and 11-19 remain in this application as amended herein; claims 2 and 7-10 are canceled; and claims 20-28 are added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6 and 11-28 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 11-14 and 16-18 have been amended to place the application in condition for allowance. It is therefore submitted that this Amendment should be entered.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6 and 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ushijima (U.S. Patent No. 5,594,426) in view of Ikonen (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,078). It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

The Ushijima patent describes a network management system in which a network management station periodically polls the network stations of the network as to their operation states, and in response to the polling inquiry, the network stations send replies to the network management station. Also, a given network station sends an event notification to the network management station when the network station is powered-on or powered-off. When the network management station receives such an event notification, the network management station changes a display color of graphical data representing that station which is shown on a display. When the network management station polls the network stations but receives no response from one or more of the stations, the network management station causes the color of the displayed graphical data for those stations to change and indicate a network failure. (See Figs. 1-2, 5-6 and 9-10; col. 3, lines 13-23; col. 6, lines 5-14; col. 7, lines 37-54; col. 8, lines 9-64; and col. 9, lines 43-60.) The Ushijima patent does not disclose or suggest a standby mode and does not disclose or suggest

determining whether the power mode of the respective apparatus is a power-on mode or a standby mode based on a detected response (as acknowledged by the Examiner).

The Ikonen patent describes an integrated display unit that includes a video display and added-on peripheral devices. The integrated display unit detects the presence of signals *generated by the operation* of the video display and *by the operation of* the peripheral devices, such as horizontal sync signals, vertical sync signals, audio signals, digital communication signals, and other signals. The integrated display unit then *sets the power consumption state* of the integrated display unit based on the presence or absence of one or more of the detected signals. (See Fig. 1; table 3; col. 2, lines 12-24; col. 3, line 14 - col. 4, line 40; col. 4, line 62 - col. 5, line 14; and col. 5, lines 40-52.)

The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Ikonen's detection method into Ushijima's system. However, the Ushijima patent and the Ikonen patent obtain state information differently and for different purposes. Ushijima describes the determination of the states of the network stations by *transmitting and receiving messages* which are generated *solely for this purpose*, namely, the polling inquiries and the responses thereto as well as the event notifications. The Ikonen patent, by contrast, describes the determination of power states by *detecting signals* that are *ordinarily generated during the operation of the peripheral devices*. A person of ordinary skill in the relevant art would not look to integrate the steps carried out by a device that relies on detection of ordinary operation signals into a system that communicates state information by messaging. Additionally, the Ushijima system detects the on or off state of the network stations for the purpose of *displaying the state of each station*, whereas the

Ikonen device determines the state for the purpose of *controlling the power consumption state* of the power supply. The ordinary practitioner would not find motivation to combine the teachings of two references which attain such vastly different objectives. It follows that the Ushijima and Ikonen patents are not combinable.

Moreover, though Ushijima shows that the *network stations* each include a memory or a disk storage unit for storing the *address* of the network management station (see Fig. 4; and col. 5, lines 18-19), the patent does not disclose or suggest storing information *on the apparatus type of a respective apparatus* and thus does not disclose or suggest a *memory means* for storing such apparatus type information. Also, the Ikonen patent does not remedy these deficiencies.

Thus, even if the references are combined in the manner asserted by the Examiner, neither reference suggests:

memory means for storing information on the  
apparatus type of the respective apparatus  
as called for in claim 1.

Additionally, neither Ushijima nor Ikonen discloses or suggests retrieving apparatus type information of the respective apparatus, and neither patent discloses or suggests controlling a display to show the apparatus type of the respective apparatus.

Neither reference suggests:

display control means for retrieving the  
apparatus type information of the respective apparatus  
from said memory means and for controlling a display  
to show the apparatus type of the respective apparatus  
and whether the power mode of the respective apparatus  
is the power-on mode, the standby mode, or the power-  
off mode  
as defined in claim 1.

It follows that neither Ushijima nor Ikonen, whether taken alone or in combination, suggests or contemplates the

information processing apparatus set out in claim 1, and claim 1 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the references.

Claims 3-4 and 11 depend from claim 1, and each further defines and limits the invention set out in the independent claim. It follows that each of claims 3-4 and 11 likewise defines a combination that is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Further regarding claim 3, the Examiner contends that Ikonen reads on the claimed power input instructing means. However, Ikonen describes setting the power output mode of the power supply of the integrated display unit based on the determined status of the display unit and the peripheral devices. The patent does not suggest receiving an external power-on command intended for a respective apparatus and does not suggest providing such a power-on command to a power source of the respective apparatus via a network when the respective apparatus is in the standard mode, as defined in claim 3.

Independent claim 5 is directed to a mode display control method and calls for:

storing information on the apparatus type of a respective one of the plurality of other apparatuses and further calls for:

retrieving the stored apparatus type information of the respective apparatus; and

controlling a display to show the apparatus type of the respective apparatus and whether the power mode of the respective apparatus is the power-on mode, the standby mode, or the power-off mode.

Claim 5 is therefore patentably distinguishable over Ishijima and Ikonen at least for the reasons described above.

Claims 12-15 depend from claim 5 and are patentably distinguishable over the references at least for the same reasons. Additionally, claim 14 includes limitations similar to those set out in claim 3 and is further distinguishable over the

cited art for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 6 relates to a recording medium recorded with a program for carrying out the method recited in claim 5, and at least for the same reasons, is patentably distinguishable over the Ishijima and Ikonen references.

Claims 16-19 depend from claim 6 and are therefore distinguishable over the references for at least the same reasons. Further, claim 18 includes limitations similar to those set out in claims 3 and 13 and are further distinguishable at least for the reasons described above.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

New claims 20-22 depend from claim 1, new claims 23-25 depend from claim 5, and new claims 26-28 depend from claim 6, and each of these claims is therefore distinguishable over the cited references at least for the same reasons. Support for these claims is found, e.g., in Figs. 3 and 6A-6B and on pages 10-11 at 13-17 of the specification.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 09/856,233

Docket No.: SONYSU 3.3-127

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: November 8, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

504026\_1.DOC